

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

In re G.C., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

G.C.,

Defendant and Appellant.

E072296

(Super.Ct.No. SWJ1800532)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Sean Lafferty, Judge.

Affirmed.

Forest M. Wilkerson, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

A juvenile wardship petition was filed against defendant and appellant G.C.
(minor) pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602. The petition alleged that

minor committed the crime of robbery. (Pen. Code, § 211.) A juvenile court found the allegation true. The court declared minor a ward and placed him in the custody of his mother, on specified terms of probation.

Minor filed a timely notice of appeal. We affirm.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On September 18, 2018, R.D. (the victim) was at school getting ready to go home. He got on his scooter, which was parked in the bike racks, and started riding toward the football field to meet his brother. On his way there, he was hit in the left eye and fell off his scooter. He did not see who hit him. The victim saw two people running toward the front of the school. One of them was on his scooter, so he started chasing him to get his scooter back. He caught up to them and grabbed on to his scooter. The person on his scooter was minor. The victim said it was his scooter, and minor replied, “This isn’t your scooter. This is my scooter.” The victim tried to pull the scooter away, and minor hit him in the left eye and rode off.

The victim reported the incident and talked to the school resource officer the next day. The officer viewed a surveillance video of the particular time and location that the victim described, in order to find out who the suspect was. The video showed minor riding on the scooter, and the officer immediately identified him since he had had over 20 prior contacts with him. The officer showed the victim a photograph of minor, and the victim identified him as the person on the scooter.

The officer went to minor’s house with a body camera on. He recorded his entire encounter with minor, and the recording was played for the court at the jurisdiction

hearing. The officer arrested minor for robbery and detained him in the back of his patrol car. He read minor his *Miranda*¹ rights, while they were parked in front of his house. Afterward, minor said he saw the scooter and did not have a ride, so he took it from the bike rack. Minor said a kid approached him after he took the scooter and was grabbing at him. Minor said he would have returned the scooter. The victim identified the scooter that was found at minor's house as his.

The officer testified that he had no reason to suspect minor had any sensory or processing disorders when he was talking to him, that minor appeared to understand his *Miranda* rights, and that minor wished to speak with him.

The court found the allegation true and sustained the petition. It commented that the circumstantial evidence showed minor intended to permanently deprive the victim of the scooter, as it was not returned until he was confronted by law enforcement.

DISCUSSION

Minor appealed and, upon his request, this court appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, setting forth a statement of the case and one arguable issue: whether the court properly found that minor had knowingly and voluntarily waived his right against compelled self-incrimination pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution and *Miranda, supra*, 384 U.S. 436, and *In*

¹ *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) 384 U.S. 436 (*Miranda*).

re Gault (1967) 387 U.S. 1, when he confessed to the officer. Counsel has also requested this court to undertake a review of the entire record.

We offered minor an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, which he has not done.

Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have conducted an independent review of the record and find no arguable issues.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

McKINSTER
J.

We concur:

RAMIREZ
P. J.

FIELDS
J.